

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/743,749   | 12/24/2003  | Young-Hyun Kang      | P56938              | 8926             |  |
| 7590 12/18/2007<br>Robert E. Bushnell                    |             |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
| Suite 300<br>1522 K Street, N.W.<br>Washington, DC 20005 |             |                      | TANG, KAREN C       |                  |  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|  |             |                      |                     | 2151             |  |
|  |             |                      |                     |                  |  |
|  |             |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|  |             |                      | 12/18/2007          | PAPER            |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| •   | Application No. | Applicant(s)     |  |  |  |
|---|-----------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summan  | 10/743,749      | KANG, YOUNG-HYUN |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary   | Examiner        | Art Unit         |  |  |  |
|   | Karen C. Tang   | 2151             |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply  |                 |                  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |                 |                  |  |  |  |
| Status  |                 |                  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 October 2007</u>.</li> <li>This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.</li> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</li> </ol>  |                 |                  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims   |                 |                  |  |  |  |
| 4)  Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.  |                 |                  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers  |                 |                  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</li> <li>11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</li> </ul>   |                 |                  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |                 |                  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>   |                 |                  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application Other:  |                 |                  |  |  |  |

- This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks file on 10/9/07.

- Claims 1-12 are presented for further examination.

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## REQUIREMENT FOR INFORMATION

Applicant and assignee of this application are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.105 to provide the following information that the examiner has determined necessary to the examination of this application: The Applicants are requested to summit information regarding disclosed information on IDLC (Integrated Digital Loop Carrier) and PLD (program loaded data) which is used to demonstrate the used in the telephony environment.

#### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/9/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the "related art" is not presented as admitted prior art or AAPA. Examiner disagrees.

The related arts sections presented the arts that are related to the invention and have already existed prior to the invention before it is filed. Therefore, the related art sections are the prior arts, and since it is submitted along with the specification, it is therefore called "Applicant Admitted Prior Art" hereinafter AAPA.

Therefore, Onno in view of AAPA, does teach/suggest the missing limitation item 1) as indicated on the response/argument filed on 10/9/07.

Applicant argues that the combination of Onno in view of AAPA does not teach/suggest the limitation of "displaying and receiving" means of the independent claim 9.

Examiner disagrees.

Onno in view of AAPA, teach an alleged missing limitation, in Fig 7, Examiner interprets shelf range as slots/ports supported by a shelf (as supported by Fig 5, element 510). Applicant has not defined what applicant meant by "shelf range", and only alleged by stating that examiner cannot interpret the shelf range is not a number of ports a shelf can support. Therefore, an argument is not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the combination of Onno in view of AAPA does not teach/suggest the limitation of "additional receiving and displaying".

Examiner disagrees.

Onno indicates that each port corresponds to a subscriber (0055), and by receiving/displaying a range of ports, the GUI in Fig 7 of Onno, also receiving/displaying a designated range of the subscribers.

Applicant argues that the combination of Onno in view of AAPA does not teach/suggest the limitation of the "transmitting means" of claim 9.

Examiner disagrees.

Onno discloses transmitting a command for registering the subscribers within the designated range in the shelf within the designated range, performing batch registration of a subscriber for a corresponding shelf (refer to 0046 and Fig 4), receiving verification information for registration of the subscriber from the corresponding shelf, and displaying a result on the graphical user interface of the client terminal (refer 0044, Lines 13-17).

Art Unit: 2151

Although Onno disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Onno is silent regarding the subscriber is a integrated digital loop carrier (IDLC), the file that is opened is program loaded data file (PLD), AAPA, in an analogous art disclosed the subscriber is a integrated digital loop carrier (IDLC), the file that is opened is program loaded data file/PLD (refer to 0003 and 0013). Hence, providing features disclosed by AAPA, would be desired for use because it is suitable for high speed intelligent telephone service, reduces expenses for building a switched network by at least 30-40% relative to the expenses of a universal digital carrier, and rapidly starts a service. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Onno by including the features provides faster services and reduces expenses.

Further, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onno et al hereinafter Onno (US 2004/0136394) in view of in view Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Application/Control Number: 10/743,749

Art Unit: 2151

1. Referring to Claims 1, 5, and 9, Onno disclosed a method for batch registration of

subscriber using file of an exchange, comprising:

(a) opening a file of selected by a client terminal accessing through a network, and listing and

displaying, on a graphical user interface of the client terminal, information relative to subscribers

included in the file (refer to 0056);

(b) displaying on the graphical user interface of the client terminal, shelf information of an

network element which will accept the subscribers included in the file (list view panel/GUI, refer

to 0056);

(c) receiving a shelf range in the displayed network element, and displaying the shelf range on

the graphical user interface of the client terminal when a mode for designing subscriber

constitution by shelves is selected (refer to Fig 7, where the list of range of Port ID are listed,

shell contains numerous ports, by showing the ports ID, is inherently a shelf, refer to 0005, that

means, shelf range is a number of slots/ports supported by a shelf);

(d) receiving a list of a range of the subscribers who will be accepted in the shelf within a

designated range of the subscribers, and displaying the list on the graphical user interface of the

client terminal (users, in Fig 7); and (e) transmitting a command for registering the subscribers

within the designated range in the shelf within the designated range, performing batch

registration of a subscriber for a corresponding shelf (refer to 0046 and Fig 4), receiving

verification information for registration of the subscriber from the corresponding shelf, and

displaying a result on the graphical user interface of the client terminal (refer 0044, Lines 13-17).

Page 5

Art Unit: 2151

Although Onno disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Onno is silent regarding the subscriber is a integrated digital loop carrier (IDLC), the file that is opened is program loaded data file (PLD), AAPA, in an analogous art disclosed the subscriber is a integrated digital loop carrier (IDLC), the file that is opened is program loaded data file/PLD (refer to 0003 and 0013). Hence, providing features disclosed by AAPA, would be desired for use because it is suitable for high speed intelligent telephone service, reduces expenses for building a switched network by at least 30-40% relative to the expenses of a universal digital carrier, and rapidly starts a service. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the system of Onno by including the features which provides faster services and reduces expenses.

2. Referring to Claims 4, 8 and 12, wherein step (b) comprises displaying a lists of shelves of the element, a number of slots in a subscriber line unit set up in each shelf, and a total number of available ports (refer to Fig 7, which demonstrates the total number of available ports, target ID vs status, it is obvious to demonstrate the number of slots, refer to 0005, lines 9-12),

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

A set of claims 2, 6, and 10, that contains limitations of "wherein the storing and display means opens the program loaded data (PLD) file of the exchange, stores the subscriber data in a

Art Unit: 2151

memory in the form of a table, displays the subscriber data stored in the table in a first area of the graphical user interface of the client terminal, and extracts and displays, in a second area of the graphical user interface of the client terminal, V5IDs and L3 addresses of each subscriber from the subscriber data stored in the table", and if rewritten in the independent form, which will be including the limitations of its independent claims, would be then allowable.

A set of claims 3, 7 and 11, that contains limitations of "wherein the table comprises subscriber information to enable an operator to search each subscriber data, confirm whether subscribers are PSTN subscribers or general telephone, and display a result to as to register the subscribers in the corresponding shelf", and if rewritten in the independent form, which will be including the limitations of its independent claims, would be then allowable.

#### Conclusion

Examiner's Notes: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen C. Tang whose telephone number is (571)272-3116. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7 - 3.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 9

KT

JOHN FOLDANSBEE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100